

PALMER & DODGE LLP
ONE BEACON STREET, BOSTON, MA 02108-3190

KENNETH W. SALINGER
(617) 573-0561
ksalinger@palmerdodge.com

TELEPHONE: (617) 573-0100
FACSIMILE: (617) 227-4420

July 3, 2001

BY MESSENGER

Bruce P. Beausejour, Esq.
Verizon
185 Franklin Street, Room 1800
Boston, MA 02110

**Re: D.T.E. Docket No. 01-20 –
Incomplete Discovery Responses by Verizon – Third Letter**

Dear Bruce:

We continue to be concerned about Verizon's failure to provide full responses to AT&T's information requests. Though we could provide a lengthy laundry list of non-responsive answers by Verizon, we have chosen instead to focus on key information that Verizon should have provided but has not. Please let me know this week whether Verizon will provide the supplemental responses requested below, and if so by when.

1. Verizon's response to ATT-VZ 2-6(d) is still incomplete. I raised this concern in my letter of June 1, 2001, but have not received any substantive response. Verizon provided the CLLI codes for three tandem switches located in buildings other than wire centers, but failed to provide the requested geographic coordinates. We again ask that you do so. It appears from Verizon's response to ATT-VZ 2-2 that this information should be readily available.
2. Verizon's response to ATT-VZ 2-41 is incomplete. AT&T asked for "all planning documents, engineering guidelines, manufacturers' specifications and the like that Verizon uses in planning and engineering its interoffice fiber ring network." Verizon says that it has no such "engineering guidelines," and it refuses to provide "manufacturers' specifications." It is difficult to believe that Verizon has no documents giving its engineers information regarding how to lay out interoffice facilities. Please provide a supplemental response that either confirms that no planning documents of any kind regarding interoffice facilities exist, or that provides copies of the planning documents that do exist.
3. Verizon's response to ATT-VZ 2-46 is difficult to understand. In its response, Verizon says that its Interoffice Facilities cost study "does not estimate total investments in the interoffice network," but that it instead is based on three

different "IOF constructs" ("High Complexity, Medium Complexity, and Low Complexity") that are in some manner "weighted together to produce average costs for IOF across the state. But Verizon neither defines nor explains these terms, nor provides any cross-reference to where this information can be found in Verizon's workpapers. Please provide a supplemental response that can be understood, which defines or explains all terms and provides appropriate cross-references to Verizon's cost study.

4. Verizon's response to ATT-VZ 3-1 remains incomplete. I raised this concern in my letter of June 15, 2001, but have not received any substantive response. Last week, in speaking with Bob Werlin, I offered to narrow the scope of our request for documents from the former GTE portion of Verizon's territory substantially. Specifically, I asked that Verizon provide contracts, bids, correspondence, or other documents from January 1, 1999, to the present regarding the prices paid or to be paid for purchasing an entire new switch. I now reiterate that request, and ask Verizon to provide this documentation right away. We have been seeking it since we first served this request on May 11, 2001, almost two months ago.
5. Request ATT-VZ 3-5 asked for Verizon's latest switch engineering guidelines. Verizon provided a document dated July 20, 1998. Please confirm whether these guidelines have been supplemented in any way since that date, including by memorandum, letter, or other planning document that is not officially referred to as a "guideline." If there are more recent documents that provide engineering guidelines for switching, including but not limited to GR-303 switch ports, those documents are covered by this request and should be provided.
6. Verizon's response to ATT-VZ 4-8(b) is not adequately responsive. This request asked Verizon to identify all wire centers that have more than one switch, excluding those with multiple remotes, and to explain with specificity the reason for the additional switch or switches. In response, Verizon directed AT&T to the listing of wire centers and switches provided in response to ATT-VZ 2-2. This is not an adequate response. Although AT&T can review this list and make some educated guesses as to which wire centers have more than one switch, Verizon has failed to provide the requested explanation in each instance of why it has multiple switches in a single wire center. Please provide a supplemental response that contains all requested information, including a separate listing of each wire center with multiple switches, and an explanation of the reason in each instance.
7. Verizon's response to ATT-VZ 4-29 is incomplete. Verizon ignored the last sentence of the request, which asks that "If Verizon has other line forecasts or trends used by the marketing, engineering, or strategic planning organizations, please provide them." Though Verizon provided information regarding the basis

for the line forecast that underlies the line inputs it has used in the SCIS model, Verizon failed to provide alternative line forecasts used elsewhere in the organization. Please provide a supplemental response that includes any line forecasts or trends used by the marketing, engineering, or strategic planning organizations.

8. Verizon's response to ATT-VZ 4-46 is not responsive. I raised this concern in my letter of June 1, 2001, but have not received any substantive response. In its answer, Verizon provided an explanation of why it adjusted a certain minutes of use capacity estimate "to the mid-point of the growth cycle." What Verizon has failed to do is provide the requested definition of the term "designed busy-hour minutes of use capacity." Our experts do not understand what Verizon means by this term. We asked Verizon to define it. Please provide a supplemental response that does so.
9. Verizon's response to ATT-VZ 10-3 is incomplete. I raised this concern in my letter of June 1, 2001, but have not received any substantive response. However, I did discuss this item last week with Bob Werlin, and was left with the impression that Verizon would follow up with a supplemental response that provides the missing information.

In its response, Verizon refused to include the requested column showing the final cost of capital decisions by the various state commissions, on the ground that Dr. Vander Weide does not maintain such information. This objection is invalid. The request was directed to Verizon, not to Dr. Vander Weide. It is inconceivable that Verizon itself would not have the requested information, at least for all of the Verizon states. Indeed, Verizon has previously provided similar information to the Rhode Island PUC in response to that Commission's record request. There is no reason why Verizon should be able to provide that information in Rhode Island, yet unable to update it for us in Massachusetts.

10. Verizon refused to provide a substantive response to ATT-VZ 14-10, 14-11, 14-14, and 14-15. The first two of these questions asked Verizon to provide the details for the ten largest hardwired and plug-in (respectively) equipment installations in Massachusetts that are reflected in the 1998 DCPR data used to develop the EF&I factor used in Verizon's cost studies. The second two sought similar information regarding the ten largest installations in each category that underlie Verizon's power factors.

Verizon refused to provide any of the requested information, claiming that it would be "burdensome" to do so. It is hard to believe that Verizon's DCPR database could not readily identify the ten largest installations in Massachusetts in

Bruce P. Beausejour
July 3, 2001
Page 4

each category, and that Verizon could not provide detailed information regarding the installation so that AT&T and the Department might be able to evaluate the basis for Verizon's EF&I and power factors. Please either provide the requested information, or provide a supplemental response that explains in detail the work that would be required to provide the information and why Verizon thinks that the work would be unduly "burdensome".

11. Verizon has refused to provide any of the documentation sought in ATT-VZ 14-32, which asked for documentation used by Verizon's engineers in conducting the survey of feeder route data. Verizon said that it would be "unduly burdensome" to provide all of the requested documentation, but it made no effort to define a subset of documentation that it could provide. According to Verizon's Direct Panel Testimony at page 89, the feeder lengths from which its proposed loop costs are derived are based upon "a survey of feeder route data conducted by Verizon MA's engineers." AT&T is entitled to obtain documentary evidence sufficient to permit it and the Department to test the validity of the survey results and feeder length estimates upon which Verizon basis its loop cost study. Please provide a supplemental response that provides such documentation.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

Kenneth W. Salinger

pc: Service List (by electronic mail only)